

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/265,214	03/10/1999	BRUCE A. PHILLIPS	1552(USW-050	4266
22193	7590 12/30/2002			
QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL INC LAW DEPT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP 1801 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 3800			EXAMINER	
			HYUN, SOON D	
DENVER, CO 80202			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2663	
			DATE MAILED: 12/30/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

yer

		Jen				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/265,214	PHILLIPS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Soon-Dong Hyun	2663				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for cause the application to become ABANDO	e timely filed  days will be considered timely.  rom the mailing date of this communication.  DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 C</u>	October 2002 .	•				
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Thi	is action is non-final.	•				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	vn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	aminer.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	• •					
<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•				
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	•					
a)   The translation of the foreign language pro	•	**				
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti						
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Inform	nary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2663

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-6, 11-13, 15, 16, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gultekin et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,793).

7

Art Unit: 2663

Regarding claims 1, 3, 4, 11-13, 15, and 21, Gultekin et al (Gultekin) discloses an upstream xDSL modem (a central office xDSL modem, TRX1) and a plurality of downstream xDSL modems (remote terminal xDSL modems), wherein packet based downstream data is broadcasted over a point-to-multipoint connection on downstream xDSL modems connected to a twisted pair copper telephone line. See col. 1, line 29, col. 5, lines 30-41, col. 9, line 63-col. 10, line 3 and FIG. 1.

Gultekin does not explicitly teach the tap, but providing an interface (tap) for each downstream xDSL modem and communications between each xDSL modem and its corresponding interface for the point-multipoint communications are inherently required, because the line is shared by the plurality of downstream xDSL modems connected to the twisted pair copper telephone line.

Regarding claims 2 and 16, Gultekin further teaches that the xDSL modem could be a VDSL modem. See col. 9, lines 35-47.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Gultekin does not explicitly teach the category of the twisted pair, but the twisted pair comprises a twisted pair of Category 3 or 5.

## Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2663

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CAR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 6. Claims 9, 10, 14, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gultekin et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,793) in view of Kaku et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,868,850).

Regarding claims 9 and 19, refer to the discussion for the claims 1 and 15 above.

However, Gultekin does not teach that upstream transmission is done over a point-to multipoint between the upstream xDSL modem and the plurality of remote xDSL modems.

Kaku et al (Kaku) discloses a multipiont type traditional modem communication system, wherein a central office modem (101) is connected to a plurality of local modems (201, 211, 221) using a twisted line via a corresponding tap to save line-use fees. See col. 1, lines 16-35, col. 5, lines 37-47 and FIG. 2.

Art Unit: 2663

Those of skill in the art would have been motivated by Kaku to incorporate the concept of the point-to-multipoint connection into Gultekin's xDSL communications to save line-use fees.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a point-to-multipoint communication system using a twisted pair for xDSL communication system.

Regarding claims 10 and 20, Gultekin+Kaku does not explicitly teach an access protocol to the central modem. Kaku teaches a time division protocol for the access. See col. 5, lines 39-40. Those of skill in the art would have been motivated by Kaku incorporate the time division multiple access protocol (TDMA) to take advantage of the TDMA protocol which is well known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a TDMA protocol.

Regarding claim 14, Gultekin+Kaku does not teach whether the central office modem is located outside the central office. Those of skill in the art would have been motivated to locate the central (office) modem outside the central office, i.e., location near to the plurality of local modems, for a higher bandwidth and a plurality of the central modems are connected to the central office via a fiber optic cable. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to locate the central modem outside the central office and connect the central modem to the central office via a fiber optic cable.

Art Unit: 2663

7. Claims 7, 8, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gultekin et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,793) and Kaku et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,868,850) as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, and further in view of Henderson et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,216).

Kultekin + Kaku as discussed above does not teach whether the central modem is connected to outside switching networks. Henderson et al (Henderson) teaches that a DSL modem in the central office is connected to an outside data network. The outside data network of Henderson comprises an ATM network for high-speed access to the Internet. See col. 1, lines 10-20. Those of skill in the art would have been motivated by Henderson to connect the central modem of Kultekin to ATM network for high-speed access to an Internet. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to connect the central modem to an ATM network.

#### Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Soon-Dong Hyun whose telephone number is (703) 305-4550. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 A.M. to 5:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen, can be reached on (703) 308-5340.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Art Unit: 2663

9. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner for Patents** 

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to: 703-872-9314 for formal communications intended for entry with a label of "OFFICIAL" and for informal or draft communications with a label of "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" (attn: Art Unit 2663, Soon-Dong Hyun).

S. Hyun

12/27/2002

Soews) on my